THE

NATIONAL LEAGUE

FOR THE

PROTECTION

OF THE

FAMILY

Annual Report for 1909

THE
National League for the Protection of the Family.

President.

Hon. SETH LOW, LL.D., New York.

Vice-Presidents.

Rt. Rev. WILLIAM LAWRENCE, D.D., LL.D., Boston.

Prof. FRANCIS G. PEABODY, D.D., Cambridge.

Corresponding Secretary.

Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale.

Treasurer.

WOLCOTT H. JOHNSON, Care of C. F. Hovey & Co., Boston.

Executive Committee.

Pres. W. E. HUNTINGTON, Ph.D., LL.D., Newton Center.

Pres. GEORGE HARRIS, D.D., LL.D., Amherst.

Prof. ALBION W. SMALL, Ph.D., LL.D., Chicago.

Rev. DANIEL MERRIMAN, D.D., Worcester.

EVERETT O. FISK, Esq., Boston.

FRANK GAYLORD COOK, Esq., Cambridge.

Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale.

REPORT

OF THE

National League for the Protection of the Family

FOR THE

YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1909

BOSTON:
THE FORT HILL PRESS
176–184 HIGH STREET
1910

Notes.

1. Our Reports for the years 1890, 1892, 1897, and 1901–9 are the only ones that can now be supplied. The Report for 1905 is a "Review of Twenty-Five Years," giving a summary of the movement regarding the family and our work for that period, and will be freely sent to all who ask for it.

2. The paper of the Corresponding Secretary read before the Congress of Arts and Science in St. Louis on the "Problem of the Family," and a report of twenty pages of a Committee on the Family, with Prof. A. R. Merriam, chairman, made to the National Council of Congregational Churches in October, 1907, has been reprinted from the minutes of the Council and will also be sent to those who desire it.

3. The Report of the Census Office on Marriage and Divorce in the United States and some twenty foreign countries, in two volumes, can be had on application to the Director of the Census, Washington, D. C.

4. A summary of the Report, of twenty pages, has been prepared by the League and will be sent to all who may write the Secretary for it, enclosing a postage stamp. An address by the Secretary on "Some Fundamentals of the Divorce Question" may also be had on application.

5. The attention of all is invited to the report of the Treasurer and the great need it shows of immediate and generous aid for our work.

Every friend of the home is invited to give us a modest place, at least, in his annual charities. The work of all benevolent societies is aided by everything that is done for the home. The League needs an immediate endowment. A form of bequest may be found on the third page of the cover.

6. Associate Annual Membership is offered to all proper persons, both ladies and gentlemen, on payment of five dollars for the year, to be renewed at the pleasure of the subscriber. Such members are members in full for the time.

7. The Treasurer, Mr. Wolcott H. Johnson, care of C. F. Hovey & Co., Boston, Mass., will gladly acknowledge all contributions. All other correspondence should be addressed to Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D., Auburndale, Mass., to whom contributions may also be sent.

Minutes.

BOSTON, MASS., January 26, 1910.

The annual meeting of the National League for the Protection of the Family was held at the Diocesan House, No. 1 Joy Street, Boston, on Wednesday, January 26, 1910, at 5 P.M.

The meeting was called to order by the President, Hon. Seth Low. Prayer was offered by Rev. C. H. Spalding, D.D. Dr. C. H. Spalding was chosen Secretary *pro tempore*. The records of the last annual meeting were read by George P. Dike, Esq. President Huntington reported briefly for the Finance Committee. The report of the Treasurer, Mr. Wolcott H. Johnson, was read and adopted after it should be audited by Mr. Herrick. The Corresponding Secretary, Rev. S. W. Dike, LL.D., read selections of his report.

President Low spoke of a conference over which he presided a few days since in Washington, in which resolutions from delegates of forty-four states were unanimously adopted in favor of uniform legislation.

Voted: To accept the report and to refer its publication to the discretion of the Corresponding Secretary.

Voted: To elect the officers of the previous year.

Voted: To adjourn.

C. H. SPALDING,
Secretary pro tempore

Report of the Corresponding Secretary.

The issue of the remaining part of the United States Marriage and Divorce Report came in the autumn. This part gives summaries and analyses of the statistics for this country, the full statistics for foreign countries so far as they can be had, and the marriage and divorce laws of this country and Europe. The completed report puts the world in possession of official material for the widest study of the subjects of marriage and divorce. It is said that on no other subject, unless it be education, has our government collected material so fully and so widely.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS OF THE YEAR.

The League has issued this year two pamphlets. One is a summary, in some twenty pages, of the leading facts of the United States Report, for general distribution, and for the convenience of those who wish the chief facts without the labor of consulting the large but admirably arranged volumes of that report. We have issued a large edition of this summary, as it will be useful for many years, and copies will be mailed to all who ask for it. The other issue is a discussion, by the Secretary of the League, of "Some Fundamentals of the Divorce Question."

The papers, all on the Family, read at the meeting of the American Sociological Society at Atlantic City in December, 1908, have been issued in the proceedings of that society for that year, filling the entire volume, and also in the *American Journal of Sociology* for May, 1909.

The Secretary of the League read a paper before the Social Science Section of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, at its meeting in Boston in December, on "The Present Status of the Divorce Question in the United States," treating it, of course, from the scientific point of view. The chief matter of the paper appears in this report. Another part of this report is taken up with a study of the chief peculiarities of European divorce law, something which has not before been presented anywhere in any degree of completeness, but which is of great value in the comparative study of divorce legislation.

OUR FINANCIAL CONDITION.

This is a matter needing serious attention. During the last four years a debt of $559.26 has accumulated, due largely to deaths among our larger contributors and the hard times for the collection of money for charitable objects like ours. We have incurred unusual expense for printing the past year, because three friends made special contributions for the issue of our special papers, and because it seemed important that this be done.

THE NEED OF AN ENDOWMENT.

Attention is again called to the need of an endowment for the League, such as shall insure a certain sum for the more fundamental expenses, and for special investigations as they may be needed. While the League is the only society at work on the problem of the Family as a whole, there are several others that care for specific interests of it. These are societies to protect children from excessive labor, from cruelty, from desertion, and to protect women and children from the subtle but most dangerous effects of sexual vice. Then we have societies for Fathers and Mothers, for Home Study, and so on.

It has sometimes seemed as if some, if not all, of these might be merged in some one society, covering in its work all subjects that immediately concern the Home, for which a generous endowment might be hoped. Certainly, nothing in the entire range of philanthropy more deeply concerns the American people. Your Corresponding Secretary is reaching the age when his work must soon be put into other hands. He would like, above all things, to see the League endowed and put on a basis of broad and permanent usefulness. For as long as human society exists, the Family will need constant attention, and everything now points to the years immediately before us as extremely critical for its interests.

LEGISLATION OF THE YEAR.

Only the more important or unusual features of the legislation of the year are noted. Arizona requires in all cases of death the return of the conjugal condition of the deceased, including the divorced. Indiana and Iowa follow the growing custom of prohibiting marriage between first cousins. Illinois forbids common law marriages. Rhode Island now requires that the marriage license in all cases where the woman is not a resident of the state be issued five days before the marriage. This is intended to prevent the numerous visits to that state merely for the purpose of marriage. Maine requires the record of intention of marriage five days before the marriage by all its own citizens, but strangely allows non-residents to have a certificate immediately. New Hampshire repealed its five days provision for non-residents a few years ago and is now taking the business that Rhode Island has given up. Maine now requires that its residents marrying out of the state shall have their marriages recorded in the place of residence within seven days after the marriage.

Rhode Island has the unique regulation for this country, but one closely paralleled in some European countries, — that in all cases of a second marriage the party or parties shall present a certificate from the town clerk of the death of the former spouse or in case of a divorce, from the clerk of the court. Besides other effects of this provision, it will make bigamies difficult, for which the facilities in this country have been far too great.

Montana forbids the intermarriage of whites with negroes, Chinese, and Japanese, and South Dakota, " with persons of the African race." Washington, among other new provisions, forbids marriage to those in the advanced stages of tuberculosis and those afflicted with venereal disease. The law

now requires that at least one physician shall certify in the case of the marriage of every male that he is not afflicted with the latter disease. This provision, though seeking a very desirable end, may be found ineffective. Utah now makes the decree for divorce interlocutory for six months or more, and Wyoming forbids the remarriage of the divorced for one year after the decree is granted, making nineteen states that have put some restriction on the remarriage of the divorced in the last twenty-two years. Wisconsin has enacted the Uniform Divorce Law. The draft of a Uniform Marriage Law will be submitted to the body having the matter in charge the coming summer.

The varying legislation of Maine and the other states noted above suggests the wisdom of taking into account before its enactment the effect of any proposed law on neighboring states. Part I of the recent United States Report makes comparative study of Marriage and Divorce legislation easy. The drift towards uniformity in this class of legislation is now pretty strong and the proposed uniform law of divorce should increase it. The gains in legislation in the last twenty years will be noted on another page.

THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE DIVORCE QUESTION IN THE UNITED STATES.

This account relates to the scientific and not the practical condition of the Divorce Question, and is confined to the results of the last twenty-year period covered by the United States Report. But the practical treatment of the subject has so largely resulted from the scientific that its results may also be seen from the present account. For many details the reader is referred to the Government Report or to our summary of its chief points.

The basis of the scientific status of the divorce question is found in the two reports of the United States government, that of 1889 and that of 1909 incorporating most of the material of the earlier report. Howard's "History of Matrimonial Institutions," in three volumes, published by the University Press of Chicago in 1904, has brought us, for the first time, a complete account of the legislation of colonial times, and an extended chapter in his "Essays in History and Jurisprudence," by Mr. Bryce, has put into convenient form the story of divorce in Roman and English law. These great works, with the papers of the American Sociological Society, are the chief sources of scientific data on the subject in literature. But we give only those points brought out in the Government Report.

CONTRIBUTIONS REGARDING THE FACTS.

The positive contributions made in recent years in the scientific field are of much value. Several things have been established beyond doubt, and others made highly probable. The Government Report has clearly shown that there is, with few exceptions, an increase of divorce throughout the civilized world, far exceeding the increase in population. Our divorce question in this country thus has become simply a part of a vast world movement, but much greater in volume here than in Europe. Some things are now clearly seen. Among these are the rate and size of the movement and its comparative distribution among

different nations and by legal causes. We also know the length of married life before divorce and the time that elapses between separation and divorce. In Europe, we have some light on the result of the efforts that are there widely required to effect a reconciliation of the parties before proceeding with the trial of the divorce case.

Very important is the light thrown on the extent of migration in this country of parties from one state to another for easier divorce. We now have a little statistical information regarding the distribution of divorces in this country among the various occupations, and in Europe on the race and religious affiliations of the divorced. We also have a little on the proportion of the divorced who remarry.

We now have much information about the percentage of cases contested, the percentage granted, the number of children involved, and something on the relation between divorce and intemperance and insanity. A good deal of light has been thrown on the effect of restrictive legislation on the number of divorces granted.

LEGAL CONDITIONS AND MOVEMENT.

Another most important contribution to our knowledge is in the field of law. The Government Report has given us in compact form a summary of the marriage and divorce laws of all our states in a way that is both authoritative and easily available for comparative and other study. From the earlier report of 1889 it can be easily seen what changes occurred in the former twenty years, and from the last one can compare, though less readily, the changes of the twenty years since the first report was made.

The trend of law can be seen. Nearly two hundred amendments, great and small, have been made in the marriage laws of the United States in the last twenty years. While many of these changes in law are very slight, others cover the introduction of a system of marriage license for the first time in eleven states, thus completing, with the exception of South Carolina, — a state which, as is well known, does not have any law touching marriage or divorce, — the adoption of some system of marriage license for every state and territory in the union. More than one hundred amendments have been made to the divorce laws of the country, nearly all of these also being for the better. Though most of these are slight, yet some of them are important, for the term of residence before divorce can be granted has been increased in thirteen states; seventeen states have made restrictions on the remarriage of divorced persons, and in the District of Columbia and in North Carolina the legal causes for which divorce can be granted have been reduced to one.

THE PROBLEM OF UNIFORMITY IN LAW.

The report of 1889 put a new face on the problem of a Uniform Divorce Law by its comparison of the place of marriage with that of divorce, and its discovery of the length of married life before divorce, and the Report for 1909 confirmed the conclusions of the earlier report. For it was shown that migration for easy divorce is confined within very small limits, both as to num-

bers granted and the places where such divorces are obtained. This showed that the problem of uniformity, though of importance, is really but a small part of the settlement of the divorce question, and that an amendment of the Constitution of the United States, aside from the practical difficulty of getting it adopted, would be of little value in reducing the number of divorces, however much it might accomplish in other ways. This disclosure of the first report revived the dormant effort at uniformity through state coöperation. Later, a congress of representatives of some forty states drew with great care such a uniform divorce bill as seemed practicable, which, within the short time it has been before the legislatures, has been enacted in three states. While it may not lessen much the number of divorces, it will remove some of the abuses of our present chaotic system. A Uniform Marriage Law is now in preparation. The report throws light, too, on the problem of uniformity from its working in Germany, Hungary, and Switzerland.

THE EFFECT OF LEGAL REFORMS.

The last report seems to make it fairly clear that legal restrictions, though reducing other evils, have less effect in lessening the number of divorces than many hoped. In some instances such restrictions seem to reduce the divorce rate for three or four years and then divorces apparently return to nearly or quite their old rate of increase. Nearly the most important thing which the investigation makes clear is that the divorce movement is everywhere a profoundly social movement that is back of law, back of religious and of educational treatment, and lying in the great social trend of the times, and, as will be indicated later, of the centuries.

HISTORICAL AND ECCLESIASTICAL CONTRIBUTIONS.

This leads us to say that Professor Howard's work gave us, for the first time, a survey of the history of marriage and divorce in this country from the earliest colonial times, and also showed its connection with the history of it in England. Mr. Bryce, in an elaborate chapter in his " Essays in History and Jurisprudence," has traced divorce in both Roman and English law, though much of the ground had been gone over before. Divorce has always been a burning question in ecclesiastical circles, and the literature of the subject is little less than enormous. Its amount, however, far exceeds its scientific value in the light of modern methods of study. The Roman Catholic Church, of course, adheres to its doctrine of the indissolubility of marriage, and enforces it in practice. Consequently, that great body is largely untouched by the modern study of the subject. The Lutheran and other Protestant churches have changed very little in their fundamental positions. They have shown much concern over the increase of divorce. But their efforts to meet the evil have been confined very closely to official warnings and to exhorting their clergy to preach against it and to refuse to celebrate the marriage of divorced persons in certain cases. Something has been accomplished, but one is disposed to think that, for a really vigorous grapple with the subject, science and the higher educational institutions have, on the whole, far out-

stripped the Church, especially in positive gains in contribution, either to our knowledge of the subject or in practical measures for betterment.

But in the field of Bible study the Church has done more. The old reliance on the discussion of the meaning of Bible texts by chief use of grammar and lexicon, with some aid from the facts that an old-fashioned archeology could give, is yielding to broader methods. Such books as Shailer Matthews' " Social Teachings of Jesus " and F. G. Peabody's " Jesus and the Social Question " may be cited as examples of fruitfulness under the newer methods. Some are beginning to see that it may be fairly questioned whether Jesus intended that his words on divorce should be taken as actual legislation, even for his Church, or only as a disclosure of the underlying principles, or perhaps of the ideals, towards which it should approach as fast as they can be realized in human society.

THE FAMILY AS THE REAL PROBLEM.

Reference has already been made to the conclusion that has been reached, through study of the statistics and of the subject in general, that the fundamental causes of the increase of divorce are more than legal, more than educational or economical or religious; that, in short, the movement is a social one in the largest use of the term. This conclusion is made all the clearer from the general recognition now, at least among scholars, that the divorce question is an inseparable part of the problem of the Family, and that, therefore, its solution, so far as a social problem may ever be said to have a solution, is dependent on the treatment accorded to the larger and inclusive problem of the Family. Strange as it may seem, this has been but dimly seen in all the discussions of the centuries until within thirty years. To-day, it has become the commonplace of the universities and the American Sociological Society, as seen in its published papers of the last year. And the Family is now recognized as the primary social group, the elementary human association, if we do not any longer call it the unit of society. This, perhaps, is the most important scientific gain of the last generation in social science on the subject before us. And the fruits of this recognition are already seen in the increase of attention given to the Family in its relation to religion and education, and to political, industrial, and philanthropic problems.

So much for the present status of the divorce question from the scientific point of view, as brought about through recent achievement.

SCIENTIFIC PROBLEMS BEFORE US: INVESTIGATION.

Investigation will go on as a matter of course. But the investigation of divorce through the use of official statistics has nearly reached its limits until the sources are increased by provision for the record of more data. Something in this direction seems practicable, and a more uniform system of presenting the data we now have may be devised. Perhaps investigation by use of private means can be made to some extent, possibly through the Carnegie and Sage funds, or from similar endowments. So far as we can, we should get at the real reasons for divorces that lie back of those technically reported from the

courts. How far is it true that the ideals of a nobler life lead to divorce? How far is divorce made the means of attaining nobler social ambitions? On the other hand, how far do motives of the baser sort enter into our divorce cases? How far does lust, on the one hand, or resentment of the proper relations of sex on the other, enter into the causes that produce divorce? How far do the subtle workings of venereal disease enter into divorce? Prof. George E. Howard, a careful and learned writer on the Family, has lately said that "venereal diseases are five times as numerous as tubercular diseases." It is the opinion of a gentleman who has made careful and wide inquiry on the point, that diseases of this kind are a powerful factor in both divorce and the decline of the American birth-rate. How far are these opinions correct? How far does divorce come from an untrained, selfish egoism that knows nothing of the joy of character achieved through self-denial and the transformation of the hard conditions of life into opportunities for the nobler conquests of character? How far does the welfare of society as a motive mold the seekers for the relief obtained in divorce? These questions and others need answers based on more certain data, if possible, than the crude guesses we now must make. Something at least can be done towards their answer by carefully planned inquiries.

That the improvement of law is a work demanding continued attention needs no proof. The Government Report makes the comparative and analytical study of the legal problem easy. The world is evidently moving, though slowly, towards a more scientific and uniform system of family law. Our people need to get in line with the movement.

Other points are quite as important. The relation of divorce and kindred evils of family life to crime needs to be seen. Carroll D. Wright used to say that, so far as crime and criminal conditions are concerned, licentiousness is the most potent factor in the whole list of the causes of crime. One has only to recall a list of homicides to see that divorce or licentiousness is a leading factor in the causes of many of them. The influence of divorce on the interests of property and in producing poverty and pauperism, and on the character of children, must be very marked. The 75,000 divorces now probably occurring annually in the United States must be a serious pecuniary burden on society through their direct and indirect effects. Our men of wealth and business have not yet given due attention to the mere pecuniary value of a wholesome family life. Here is almost a virgin field for the student.

EDUCATION AND THE HOME.

Then the educational place and work of the Home needs attention. Educators will probably agree that, all things considered, the weakest spot in our educational system at present is the Home. More than anything else the Home is probably responsible for the inefficiency and disregard of order that most trouble the schoolroom, make a neighborhood nuisance of many otherwise fairly good boys, and for the boys and girls who worry the life of the devoted Sunday-school teacher. It is probably to the Home that the responsibility for much of the indifference of the college boy to the higher educational ideals, of which the complaint now seems to be general, must be charged.

Hardly anywhere else in all the world does the Family need more special attention than here in these United States. And the neglect of the churches to develop the religious resources of the Home, as well as its multiplying societies for taking over the natural work of the Home, have a relation to the increase of divorces that needs study.

FURTHER HISTORICAL STUDY NEEDED.

The historical forces that have led up to the present situation still need consideration. The early Christian treatment of divorce, chastity, and the other relations of Family life by themselves, as separate concerns with little thought of their being parts of one problem of the Family itself, and the formation of the canon law of divorce along the individualistic and socially disintegrating lines of the later Roman law, when status had largely given place to contract, and the Family to the Individual, should be carefully and fully studied. So, too, should we see the influence of the great social individualizing forces that went along with the Protestant Reformation and contributed with it to the creation of the social soil of modern times in which divorce naturally thrives. I name such as the invention of printing, the discovery of America, the invention of gunpowder, and the beginnings of modern science, all of which contributed to the individualizing process that encourages divorce.

Then in the latter part of the eighteenth century a fresh impulse to the movement is marked by such names as Rousseau, Jefferson, Arkwright, Adam Smith, and Joseph Priestley, and the great events of the American and French revolutions. And still again in this country in the early half of the nineteenth century we have the rise of the temperance reform, the period of great revivals of religion, the anti-slavery discussion, the beginnings of the agitation for the rights of women, the use of steam railways, and the telegraph, the beginnings of the daily newspaper, the development of the factory system and of foreign immigration. These tended to single out the individual from the groups to which he had belonged and treat him from the egoistic basis, magnifying his rights instead of his duties, and solving his difficulties from that point of view. Since the Civil War there has been a strong tendency towards combination in the larger social groups at the expense of the smaller. Communal group action has taken the place of action in domestic groups. The Home has been turning over its former work to the shop, the school, and the Church. At least the development of the resources of the Home has not gone on with the corresponding care that has been given to the development of communal forms of activity. This, on the whole, has been good for society, but not productive of so much good as would have come of a proportionate attention to the Home. And all this has favored the disintegration of the Family by divorce. In other words, the increase of divorce is due fundamentally to the deeper movement of modern civilization.

THE INFLUENCE OF EVOLUTIONARY THEORIES.

Just at this point we are met with the assertion that divorce is the healthful incident of an inevitable evolution and that, therefore, we can and ought to

do very little to check the movement. And this position is taken in the name of social science. This paper can close only in leaving us confronted with the issue thus raised with some pertinent questions for the student to consider. How far is the dictum of one of the great students of human society of the last generation applicable here, which maintains that modern civilization is little more than the combination and recombination of the old Aryan civilization in new forms? Is this growing disintegration of the Family to go on, or has it nearly reached its limit? Are we making enough of the fact that the breaking down of the domestic organization and of the more elemental communal forms of social order is much like the breaking down of cell and tissue in the human body? With all our confidence in the principles of evolution as applied to the explanation of the facts of human society, are we quite sure that we have got our feet fully and fairly on the ground where we profess to stand? Are we yet making sufficient allowance for the fact that as we rise in the scale of being, the power of the will to shape life increases? Do we yet make enough of the power of man to master his circumstances in many directions? Are we yet making what we should of the increasing ability of what the biologists are now calling mutations in the life of plants and animals when we come to human life and human society? How far is the idea of the attainment of character through a courageous acceptance of hard conditions losing or gaining ground with the mass of common people?

The present status of the divorce question is pointing to the immediate urgency of the best scientific study of such topics as these, which are wide as human society itself. Religious tradition, ecclesiastical authority, will, by themselves, count for very little. In short, the whole problem of divorce and the Family has become a scientific one of the most complicated nature as well as of the highest practical importance, reaching in every direction for its facts, its causes, and its remedies.

Psychological and philosophical discussions are now going on. But at present they have not got far enough beyond the region of speculative philosophy as to have the scientific value which is desirable.

SOME PECULIARITIES OF FOREIGN DIVORCE LAWS.

European Marriage Laws.

While this section is devoted to the peculiarities of foreign divorce laws, a little may be said first regarding some features of foreign marriage laws that are unlike those of our own country. The most fundamental characteristic of continental marriage law is the strong tendency in all recent legislation on the subject to establish civil marriage as obligatory, but leaving the parties free to have a religious ceremony following the civil contract, but in no case to precede it. England practically allows either form of marriage. In Austria the civil marriage is required when both parties belong to no legally recognized religious confession. In other cases the religious rite is required, only the parties may resort to the civil authorities in case the ecclesiastial powers refuse without legal reason to perform the ceremony. In some of the less progressive countries — Bulgaria, Finland, Croatia, Slavonia, and Servia — the religious ceremony alone is recognized.

The age up to which parental consent is required is generally higher in Europe and much more rigidly enforced than in this country. In the Netherlands it is put at thirty years for both sexes. In France, it has recently been reduced to twenty-one years, while in Switzerland it is twenty, and in Norway only eighteen. But more striking than the higher age limit is the universal requisition for the publication of banns from the church, or an equivalent public announcement for a period of two or three weeks before the marriage can take place. Then in Europe the marriage must take place in the city, town, or parish, as the case may be, where the parties actually reside, with carefully guarded exceptions. And the marriage must be recorded in the town or other place of residence. Running from place to place or from state to state to be married is generally, if not everywhere, impossible in Europe. Restrictions on the remarriage of persons after the dissolution of a former marriage for any cause are common. A period of from six months to a year is generally required to elapse before another marriage can take place. In many countries the dissolution of all marriages must be entered on the margin of the original record of the marriage. In Austria at least the burden of proof of the dissolution of a former marriage rests on the applicant for a new marriage license. In these ways most foreign countries keep a strong hold on the marriage of their people and guard against irregularities that are painfully common under our more lax systems.

Foreign Divorce Laws.

But it is with foreign divorce laws that we especially deal at this time. For their peculiarities are perhaps less understood among us than the features of European marriage laws. While in some countries jurisdiction over divorce suits still is within the control of the Church, or, as in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, divided between royalty, the courts, and other civil authority, it is generally given to a few courts, whose judges are usually trained especially for judicial duties and are not mere lawyers. In England and Wales there is only one divorce court, and generally in Europe the courts are far fewer in number than in this country, where nearly three thousand courts of various grades have jurisdiction over divorce suits. In some countries the civil law respects the doctrines of divorce held by the different religious bodies, divorces being allowed to Protestants, Jews, and others on grounds forbidden to their Catholic populations.

Legal Grounds for Divorce.

The technical grounds for divorce, though in general much the same as in the United States, present some variations and restrictions that are not usual in this country. Desertion seems to play a far less important part in the divorces of Europe than in those of the United States. In England, it is a ground only when accompanied with adultery, and is allowed as a sufficient cause alone in applications for limited divorce. In Germany, notice must be served on the deserting party calling for return to conjugal duty and a year must then elapse before the case can be taken up for decision. In Hungary, abandonment

is now a legal cause for divorce only after certain provisions for notice and for the return of the deserting party have been complied with. In Switzerland, wilful absence for two years is a ground for divorce if the absentee has failed for six months to obey a judicial summons to return.

Divorce for cruelty and crime does not differ very much in Europe from the practice in the United States. Still, such specifications as dishonorable treatment, threats on life, mental indignities, are found under the head of cruelty. Among the specifications of crime we find imprisonment for life, a sentence that brings loss of civil rights, sentence for a capital offense, or, in Russia, to banishment. Drunkenness nowhere appears as a specified cause for divorce except in Scotland (where it permits separation only), in some of the Australian colonies, in Bulgaria when it causes squandering of property, and in Sweden. But in France, and possibly elsewhere, violence is construed to include habitual drunkenness. Drunkenness is given as the cause of the divorce in 15 per cent of the cases in Bulgaria in 1887–1896, and in about 10 per cent in the years since. In Sweden, the cases for drunkenness are classified with those under dissipation and violent and troublesome temper. For all these causes together there were 27 per cent in 1887–1896, and nearly 33 per cent in 1897–1905. Insanity seems to be a legal ground for divorce in less than a third of European countries whose laws are given in the Government Report of this year.

Mutual Consent.

Mutual consent and aversion, however frequently they may be the real causes for divorce in this country, are never put on the statute books of our states as technically legal grounds. But eight European countries and also Japan provide for divorce for mutual consent or aversion. France, however, since 1884 forbids divorce on mutual consent except among the Mohammedans of Algeria, where it is allowed to them only. Germany now does not permit it. But usually careful restrictions are made on divorces for these two causes. In Denmark, divorce by mutual consent can be granted only after three years' separation. In Italy, which has separation only, it can be allowed only after attempts at reconciliation. In the Netherlands and in Norway separations only are allowed by mutual consent. In the former, separation is convertible into divorce after five years. And in Switzerland it is allowed only when it is made to appear that further living together is incompatible with the true intent of marriage. In Austria, separation is permitted on mutual consent, and absolute divorce may be had for unconquerable aversion not necessarily mutual. Mutual consent was the cause of 71 per cent of the separations. Aversion was the cause reported in Austria in about 6 per cent of the cases in 1887–1896, and in Vienna in 40 per cent. But in the next ten years it appears in 6.7 per cent of the cases in Austria, while in Vienna in only 9.2 per cent. The latter figure is probably more nearly the normal one, the former being perhaps due to some peculiar method of classification. In Switzerland, various causes giving rise to "strained relations" cover 26 per cent of the divorces for a considerable period.

Exceptional Causes.

There are a few exceptional causes in Europe. In Hungary, for example, the judge may grant divorce for such reason as he may think renders the continuance of cohabitation unendurable. This was the old "omnibus cause" of Connecticut and a few other states, but it is now generally discarded in the United States. In Servia, apostasy from the Christian religion is a legal ground for divorce. Asiatic countries have their peculiar causes for divorce. In Formosa, disobedience of the wife, barrenness, lewd conduct, jealousy, leprosy, or incurable disease, loquacity, larceny, and poverty, most of them causes laid down by Confucius, are grounds for divorce. The divorce law of Japan of 1898, bringing marriage and divorce for the first time in that country under the control of public law, has some peculiar provisions for divorce growing out of the domestic institutions of that country. Divorce by mutual consent does not require any procedure in court. But it is not valid unless it is properly registered. In Germany and Hungary, actions for divorce must be brought within six months after the injured party became cognizant of the offense.

Provisions for Reconciliation.

While the judges and others sometimes make efforts at the reconciliation of parties seeking a divorce in this country, there is nowhere statutory provision requiring such efforts. But no less than fourteen European countries provide by law for it. In Austria this must be done in all divorce cases if there seems to be any chance of success. And in all suits for separation by mutual consent this must be done at least three times at intervals of not less than eight days. In several countries efforts at reconciliation must be made before the trial can proceed at all. In some there must be several attempts, in Bulgaria as many as four at intervals of three months. In some the petitioner must first appear alone for the purpose before the judge, and then with the other party, but without counsel from either side. In Sweden, separation can be granted only after attempts at reconciliation are made by the ecclesiastical authorities. In Germany and Servia, in cases of divorce for desertion, after the attempt at reconciliation, which must be made in application for divorce for any cause, one year must be allowed for the return of the deserting party before the divorce can be granted.

Unfortunately, few of these countries furnish any statistics showing the number of reconciliations effected. But in Italy, in the last twenty years, in about 53 per cent of the cases, the parties were either reconciled or the suits abandoned. In Prussia, 39 per cent of the cases were reconciled in 1869–1879; and in Dresden, conjugal rights were restored in 35 per cent of the cases in 1867–1878, and the actions were withdrawn in 5 per cent more. In Servia, in 1889–1896, those reconciled were 8 per cent of all, and in the next eight years they were 5 per cent. Probably the requirement for efforts at reconciliation reduces the number of applications for divorce by weeding out many cases of those who do not care to meet the requirement of the law on this point and so never apply for divorce.

Nearly all provisions regarding procedure are much more strict in Europe than in this country. In Austria a special law radically modifies the usual rules of evidence. Both in Austria and Hungary the law provides for the most vigorous defense of all divorce suits.

Local Record of Divorces.

One more important feature of European divorce laws is that of some seven leading countries requiring that the divorce be recorded in the place of residence of the parties. In Belgium, this must be done within two months after the divorce is granted or the divorce is of no effect. In Austria, Germany, Hungary, and Switzerland, the divorce must be recorded on the margin of the original record of the marriage which is dissolved, much as the discharge of a mortgage is entered in some of our states. In Switzerland, the fact must be communicated to the registrar at the place of residence and birth of the parties. This enables the authorities to prevent bigamies, which are disgracefully numerous in some parts of our country. The law in Rhode Island, noted under the legislation of the year, is a good beginning in this direction.

Though divorces are increasing in nearly all countries of Europe as well as in the United States, and generally almost as rapidly there as here, the stream is much smaller in volume in Europe than in the United States. Some of the difference is no doubt due to differences in social conditions and to the more sluggish response of Europe to certain progressive tendencies. But no small part of the difference must be due to the small number and high character of the courts in Europe which deal with the marriage relation and to the safeguards that European laws throw around marriage and divorce. These peculiarities of European law are certainly deserving of our study to see how we may still further improve our own systems of family law.

THE LESSON OF IT ALL.

The most fundamental conclusion from the present condition of the subject is that, notwithstanding all the gains in legislation, — and on the whole these are remarkable, — there is reason to believe that the great work that is needed is only well begun and that we are now entering upon a most critical period in the movement. For it is now clearly established, as the League has always held that, with all the gains in better legislation and the acknowledged need of much more in the same direction, the great work is to be done through the forces of religion and education, and that now these need to be aroused and put to their share in the work. The last year has brought from educators increasing demand for qualities in children and college students that the Home can best supply. More and more they are coming to see that the weak spot in the American educational system is the lack of an adequate place in it for the Home as an educational force, to be carefully cultivated and brought into more complete relation to the school. And the Church is quite as much in the need of an awakening as any other social institution. It is very well for the great national assemblies of the churches to have occasional papers on the work of the Home in religion, and to occasionally hold conferences on the subject

and hear at long intervals an occasional sermon on it and to pass resolutions not to marry divorced persons. But these are all trifling matters compared with what needs to be done. As a whole, the educators are far more alive to the educational value of the Home than ecclesiastical leaders are to its religious and social powers. The Church as a whole is not awake to the need of concentrating attention on the Home in order to secure those high ideals of marriage and family life, that need of personal sacrifice of individual ambition to domestic and public interests, and that purity of physical being that is essential to happy and fruitful marriage. The Church does not yet see that it can inspire the Home to that conduct and to those virtues that are the surest protection we have against poverty, ignorance, vice, and crime. It has not yet learned to set apart some definite percentage of its charitable funds to promote the interests of the Home. No revival is more needed than the revival within the Church itself of a sense of its obligation to do vastly more than it now is doing for the Home.

Here is the most pressing work before us.

Respectfully submitted,

SAMUEL W. DIKE,
Corresponding Secretary.

Treasurer's Report.

RECEIPTS		$2,010 35
EXPENDITURES:		
Postage	$49 50	
Stationery	9 49	
Printing	246 40	
Traveling	48 05	
Telephone	8 55	
Express	2 70	
Press clippings	6 55	
Rent	50 00	421 24
		$1,589 11
Salary of S. W. Dike	$1,800 00	
Deficit for the year ending December 31, 1909		$210 89
Deficit to January 1, 1909		348 37
Amount of debt, January 1, 1910		$559 26

JANUARY 27, 1910.

I have this day examined the foregoing accounts of the Treasurer, for the year ending December 31, 1909, with vouchers for the same, and find them correct.

W. B. HERRICK, *Auditor.*

RECEIPTS.

Jan.	1.	Mrs. William E. Dodge, New York, N. Y.	$100 00	
	2.	Hon. Seth Low, LL.D., New York, N. Y.	50 00	
	9.	"A Vermont Lady"	100 00	
	14.	Rev. S. P. Leeds, D.D., Hanover, N. H.	2 00	
	14.	President W. E. Huntington, LL.D., Newton Center	5 00	
	18.	Rev. Charles G. Ames, D.D., Boston	5 00	
	18.	Grace Church, New York, N. Y.	15 00	
	23.	Mrs. Wallace H. Camp, Waterbury, Conn.	50 00	
	29.	Rev. W. P. Alcott, Boxford	2 00	
	29.	Hon. Arthur T. Lyman, Boston	5 00	
	30.	State Street Church, Portland, Me.	10 00	
	30.	President Edward M. Gallaudet, LL.D., Washington, D.C.	10 00	
	30.	Rev. John Phelps Taylor, D.D., Andover, Mass.	10 00	
		Received in January		$364 00
Feb.	2.	Prof. Waldo S. Pratt, Hartford, Conn.	$3 00	
	2.	Hon. Moses Giddings, Bangor, Me.	5 00	
	2.	Rt. Rev. Chauncy B. Brewster, D.D., Hartford, Conn.	3 00	
	3.	Rev. Thomas W. Thompson, Worcester	5 00	
	4.	Mrs. George Ripley, Andover, Mass.	10 00	
	4.	Dr. Lucien Howe, Buffalo, N. Y.	5 00	
	6.	James C. Braman, Auburndale	10 00	

Feb.	6.	Alfred T. White, Brooklyn, N. Y.	$10 00	
	10.	Rt. Rev. Daniel S. Tuttle, D.D., LL.D., St. Louis, Mo.	5 00	
	10.	Mrs. George H. Corliss, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
	13.	Rt. Rev. John Scarborough, D.D., Trenton, N. J.	10 00	
	18.	Rev. W. Stanley Emery, Concord, N. H. (extra for printing)	15 00	
	18.	Prof. Francis G. Peabody, D.D., Cambridge, Mass.	10 00	
	18.	George Burnham, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.	25 00	
	18.	Mrs. William G. Benedict, Boston	5 00	
	25.	Mrs. Charlotte F. Blackman, Waterbury, Conn.	10 00	
	26.	Prof. Austin B. Bassett, D.D., Hartford, Conn.	5 00	
		Mrs. John S. Mitchell, Waterbury, Conn.	50 00	
	27.	Rt. Rev. A. C. A. Hall, D.D., Burlington, Vt.	5 00	
	27.	Rev. George B. Johnson, Burlington, Vt.	5 00	
		Received in February		$206 00
Mar.	6.	Rt. Rev. Alexander H. Vinton, D.D., Springfield, Mass.	$5 00	
	8.	Rev. F. N. Peloubet, D.D., Auburndale	10 00	
	8.	Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., LL.D., Boston	25 00	
	16.	Rev. Arthur Lawrence, D.D., Stockbridge, Mass	25 00	
	16.	Old South Church, Boston	25 00	
	16.	C. E. Clift, Arlington	5 00	
	17.	Prof. Henry W. Farnam, R.P.D., New Haven, Conn.	25 00	
	22.	"W. G. S.," Philadelphia, Pa.	5 00	
	27.	Christ Church, Hartford, Conn.	10 00	
		Received in March		$135 00
Apr.	7.	Miss Martha C. Burgess, Dedham	$5 00	
	10.	Mrs. Amelia H. Armstrong, Berkeley, Cal.	1 00	
	13.	Rev. A. B. Hunter, Raleigh, N. C.	5 00	
	15.	Frank S. Haupt, Redlands, Cal.	3 00	
	16.	Rev. David H. Tribou, Philadelphia, Pa.	1 00	
	16.	Grace Church, New York, N. Y.	15 00	
	19.	Philip Willner, Auburndale	2 00	
	28.	Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Worcester	10 00	
	28.	Central Church, Worcester	10 00	
		Total received in April		$52 00
May	3.	J. D. R. Lamson, Toledo, Ohio	$10 00	
	4.	George Burnham, Sr., Philadelphia, Pa.	25 00	
	24.	St. Bartholomew's Church, New York, N. Y.	25 00	
	24.	Prof. Samuel Hart, D.D., Middletown, Conn.	5 00	
	24.	Hon. O. V. Coffin, Middletown, Conn.	5 00	
	27.	Broadway Tabernacle, New York, N. Y.	10 00	
	29.	William B. Taylor, Lynn	5 00	
		Total received in May		$85 00
June	17.	Rt. Rev. W. N. McVickar, D.D., LL.D., Providence, R. I.,	$10 00	
	19.	Stuart Wood, Philadelphia, Pa.	15 00	
	19.	Rev. Charles F. Dole, Jamaica Plain	5 00	
	25.	Charles Morris Smith, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
		Total received in June		$40 00
July	2.	Mrs. C. P. Turner, Philadelphia, Pa.	$25 00	
	8.	Asylum Hill Congregational Church, Hartford, Conn.	25 00	
	14.	Samuel V. Hoffman, New York, N. Y.	25 00	
	20.	Hon. Arthur H. Wellman, Malden	5 00	
		Total received in July		$80 00

Aug.	5.	St. John's Parish, Stamford, Conn.	$19 35	
	5.	Hon. Samuel B. Capen, LL.D., Boston	10 00	
	5.	F. B. Marsh, New York	5 00	
	5.	"From Connecticut"	5 00	
	20.	Mrs. R. H. Dana, Cambridge	5 00	
		Total received in August		$44 35
Sept.	1.	Rev. Walker Gwynne, Summit, N. J.	$2 00	
	9.	Hon. Jacob P. Bates, Boston	5 00	
	13.	Prof. W. F. Willcox, LL.D., Ithaca, N. Y.	5 00	
	16.	Herbert A. Wilder, Newton	10 00	
		Received in September		$22 00
Oct.	4.	Hon. Frederick J. Kingsbury, LL.D., Waterbury, Conn.	$25 00	
	6.	Rev. John H. Denison, D.D., Williamstown	10 00	
	23.	Miss Maria R. Hicks, Fall River	5 00	
	23.	Messrs. Ginn & Co., Boston	10 00	
		Total received in October		$50 00
Nov.	6.	Special, for printing "Summary of the United States Report," with interest, Hon. John E. Parsons, New York	$53 00	
	6.	Ditto, from J. D. R. Lamson, Toledo, Ohio	50 00	
	9.	Rev. W. Spooner Smith, Worcester	10 00	
	9.	Rathbone Gardner, Providence, R. I.	5 00	
	10.	Dr. William C. Rives, Washington, D. C.	5 00	
	10.	Mrs. Gilman C. Hill, Waterbury, Conn.	5 00	
	10.	Edward P. Dutton, New York	5 00	
	11.	"A Friend," Holyoke	2 00	
	13.	Hon. Francis Lynde Stetson, LL.D., New York	30 00	
	13.	St. John's Church, Providence, R. I.	20 00	
	15.	Miss Lucy W. Burr, Auburndale	25 00	
	17.	St. Stephen's Church, Pittsfield	10 00	
	18.	Mrs. John S. Brigham, Worcester	5 00	
	18.	Robert H. Gardiner, Boston	10 00	
	19.	W. W. Lockwood, New York	5 00	
	19.	Trinity Church, Boston	15 00	
	19.	Prof. William North Rice, LL.D., Middletown, Conn.	5 00	
	20.	A. R. Kimball, Waterbury, Conn.	5 00	
	26.	"Friends," Thompson, Conn.	8 00	
	26.	Rev. Horace Dutton, Auburndale, Mass.	5 00	
	26.	Miss Grace H. Dodge, New York	50 00	
	27.	Church of the Advent, Boston	5 00	
	29.	Robert C. Ogden, New York	25 00	
	29.	Prof. C. R. Henderson, D.D., Chicago, Ill.	2 00	
	29.	Rev. Herbert W. Lathe, Prescott, Ariz.	5 00	
		Total received in November		$365 00
Dec.	1.	Arthur L. Shipman, Hartford, Conn.	$25 00	
	1.	Rev. John G. Davenport, D.D., Waterbury, Conn.	10 00	
	1.	Rev. Francis Goodwin, D.D., Hartford, Conn.	25 00	
	2.	Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, LL.D., New Haven, Conn.	50 00	
	2.	Rev. W. C. Gordon, Ph.D., Auburndale	5 00	
	3.	Hon. D. M. Camp, New Britain, Conn.	5 00	
	6.	St. Bartholomew's Church, New York	50 00	
	6.	George I. Rockwood, Worcester, Mass.	10 00	
	9.	Rev. Herbert S. Johnson, Boston	5 00	
	10.	Rev. S. C. Bushnell, Arlington	5 00	
	10.	Rev. James W. Bixler, D.D., New London, Conn.	10 00	
	10.	Rev. E. E. Strong, D.D., Auburndale	2 00	

Dec. 11.	Hon. John E. Parsons, New York	$25 00	
13.	Wolcott H. Johnson, Boston	25 00	
15.	Miss M. Josephine Allen, Boston	5 00	
15.	R. S. Douglas, Brookline	5 00	
17.	William H. Swift, Pittsfield	25 00	
17.	Arthur S. Johnson, Boston	10 00	
21.	Prof. Melancthon W. Jacobus, D.D., LL.D., Hartford, Conn	25 00	
21.	Rev. William J. Tucker, DD., LL.D., Hanover, N. H.	10 00	
21.	Pres. George Harris, D.D., LL.D., Amherst, Mass	5 00	
24.	St. Stephen's Church, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
17.	George I. Alden, Worcester	10 00	
25.	" A friend," Brookline	20 00	
25.	Rev. Cornelius H. Patton, D.D., Newton	5 00	
27.	Prof. Williston Walker, D.D., New Haven, Conn	5 00	
27.	Hon. Walter George Smith, Philadelphia, Pa	5 00	
27.	Mrs. David P. Kimball, Boston	25 00	
28.	Everett O. Fisk, Boston	5 00	
29.	Rt. Rev. Frederick Burgess, Garden City, N. Y.	5 00	
29.	William B. Herrick, Auburndale	10 00	
29.	Rev. A. B. Hunter, Raleigh, N. C.	5 00	
30.	Rt. Rev. W. A. Leonard, D.D., Cleveland, Ohio	10 00	
31.	Rev. Frederick B. Allen, Boston	5 00	
31.	Hon. Arthur H. Wellman, Malden	5 00	
31.	Jerome C. Borden, Fall River	5 00	
31.	Arthur C. Farley, Wellesley Hills	5 00	
31.	Miss Edith Woolsey, New Haven, Conn	15 00	
31.	Henry B. Day, West Newton	25 00	
31.	Arba N. Lincoln, Fall River	5 00	
31.	Prof. Theodore Woolsey, LL.D., New Haven, Conn	15 00	
31.	Rev. Samuel W. Dike, Auburndale	25 00	
31.	Rev. William T. Manning, D.D., New York, N. Y.	10 00	
	Total received in December		$567 00

At the annual meeting of the National League for the Protection of the Family, after hearing the report of the treasurer, Hon. Seth Low, our president, made some statements of the high value he had put upon its work, and spoke of the evidence he had seen of its worth at the recent meetings of the National Civic Federation and of the Conference of Governors in Washington. He then said he should hereafter double his own annual contribution, and also assumed responsibility for one half the present debt of $559.26. Others of the officers immediately took it upon them to secure about one fourth more, and it is hoped that the entire sum due the corresponding secretary will be raised very soon.

But the death of several of our largest contributors recently, and a loss in receipts since the financial troubles of 1907, compel us to ask urgently for money from new sources or we shall be almost as badly off at the end of this year as ever. Only to a small extent can we ask our present contributors to increase their gifts, though some are doing it.

The League has no costly office force, as societies that raise several thousand dollars have and that put a large part of their receipts into financing their work, and must depend largely on unsolicited contributions. Nearly our entire receipts go directly into our work. Probably no other philanthropic work has accomplished as much in proportion to its cost as this has. For none is there likely to be a more permanent demand.

For the briefest summary of the aims of the League, its methods and results, see the circular of Mr. Low and President Huntington, prepared last autumn. For a fuller account write the Corresponding Secretary at Auburndale, Mass., for the "Review of Twenty-five Years" and later reports.

Kindly send our treasurer your contribution or pledge soon.

CHAIRMAN OF THE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The National League for the Protection of the Family

PRESIDENT
HON. SETH LOW, LL.D., NEW YORK

VICE-PRESIDENTS
RT. REV. WILLIAM LAWRENCE, D.D., LL D., BOSTON
PROF. FRANCIS G. PEABODY, D.D., CAMBRIDGE

CHAIRMAN OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
PRES. W. E. HUNTINGTON, LL.D., NEWTON CENTER

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY
REV. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL D., AUBURNDALE

TREASURER
WOLCOTT H. JOHNSON, CARE OF C. F. HOVEY & CO., BOSTON

The aim of the League is the protection and improvement of the Family by scientific and practical means.

In the belief that full and accurate knowledge is the basis of all sound reform, the League proposed and secured the U. S. Report of 1889 on Marriage and Divorce, and lately the bringing of that Report down to date. This gives a knowledge of the laws and their changes and of the statistics of this and some twenty foreign countries for forty years.

Through publication in leading reviews and elsewhere, by the discussions in its own annual reports and special issues, by lectures in the higher educational institutions, the study of the Family has been stimulated until it has become general, and a generation of leaders is coming forward, fairly competent to deal with what is regarded as one of the urgent problems of the times.

To show what can be done in larger use of the Home, the Home Department of the Sunday-School was devised by the Secretary, and it now has half a million members.

The Government Report shows that more than 200 amendments to the Marriage and Divorce Laws of the country have been made in the last twenty years, nearly all of them being in the direction of better regulations on these subjects. Marriage license laws have been introduced for the first time in 11 states. The term of residence before divorce has been increased in 13 states, and 17 have made restrictions on the remarriage of divorced persons. A Uniform Divorce Law has been drafted and already enacted in three states. A Uniform Marriage Law is now in preparation.

In all this work the League has had a leading part in arousing and directing public opinion.

The Government reports have made clear, what we have all along seen, that back of legal reform and supporting it must be the improvement of home life. The great work of enlisting the church, the press, the school, and the home itself in this task is now thrust upon us. And all this is the more urgent because, pleading the evolutionary tendencies, many are content with the growing disintegration of the family.

We frankly ask you to make some personal sacrifice that this work may receive adequate support, and present deficiencies in our receipts may be made up immediately. As President Roosevelt put it, while in office, every other institution and interest may be at its best, and yet, if the Family is not upon a proper basis, all else is in vain.

Kindly send your contribution promptly to Wolcott H. Johnson, Treasurer, care of C. F. Hovey & Co., Boston, or directly to the Secretary at Auburndale, Mass.

SETH LOW,
President.

WILLIAM E. HUNTINGTON,
Chairman of the Executive Committee.

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

National League for the Protection of the Family

ARTICLE I. This association shall be called the NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY.

ART. II. Its object shall be, through the improvement of public sentiment and legislation, to protect the institution of the Family, especially as affected by existing evils relating to Marriage and Divorce, and to secure its proper efficiency in individual and social life. It may coöperate with auxiliary or other bodies having similar aims in such ways as may be deemed expedient.

ART. III. It shall consist of the following persons, having power to fill vacancies and to add to their number.

ART. IV. The officers of this society shall be a President, not more than five Vice-Presidents, a Recording Secretary, a Corresponding Secretary, a Treasurer, and an Executive Committee of not more than twelve persons, of which committee the Corresponding Secretary shall be a member, and of which not less than three shall constitute a quorum, having the duties indicated in their several offices, to be elected at the Annual Meeting, and to hold office until their successors are appointed.

ART. V. The LEAGUE shall hold its Annual Meeting on the third Wednesday in January, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman of the Executive Committee, and at such hour and place as shall be indicated in the call of the committee.

ART. VI. Amendments of this Constitution, of which due notice shall have been given in the call of any Annual Meeting, may be adopted at such meeting by the vote of two thirds of the members present.

ART. COMMUNICATIONS concerning the work of the LEAGUE and its general business should be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary, Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale Mass.

CONTRIBUTIONS should be sent to the Treasurer Mr. WOLCOTT H. JOHNSON, care of C. F. Hovey & Co., Boston.

FORM OF BEQUEST

I hereby give and bequeath to the NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY, a corporation created by the Laws of the State of Connecticut, or its successor or assigns, the sum of.....dollars, the principal [or income, as may be desired] of which is to be used for the purposes for which said Corporation was chartered.